DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 221 927 EA 014 999

AUTHOR Seaberg, John J., Jr.; Wood, Maxie M.
TITLE Personality Traits of Urban Female and Male Administrators and Congruence of These Traits with the Occupational Stereotypes of the Male Managerial Model.
PUB DATE 20 Mar 82
NOTE 21p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New York, NY, March 19-23, 1982).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrators; Elementary Secondary Education; Females; Males; Models; *Personality Traits; *Sex Differences; Sex Role; *Sex Stereotypes; Statistical Analysis
IDENTIFIERS Adjective Check List (Gough and Heilbrun); Male Managerial Model; Occupational Stereotypes

ABSTRACT

A study showed personality traits of both female and male educational administrators in a southwestern urban public school system to be inconsistent with the standards of stereotypical sex-appropriate roles found in earlier studies. Based theoretically on Holland's vocational choice theory, the study surveyed all 64 female administrators at the building and central office levels and a random sample of 64 male administrators at both levels, utilizing 7 scales of Gough and Heilbrun's Adjective Check List as a data collection instrument. Statistical analysis of the data revealed that female administrators' traits were significantly different from those of males; females' scores were more congruent with occupational stereotypes of the male managerial model than were males' scores; the traits of females at the central office level differed from those of females at the building level; males at both levels shared similar traits; and the traits of both males and females proved inconsistent with society's standards of sex-appropriate roles. The researchers suggest that these findings can be explained if (1) the sample in this study proves atypical, (2) educational administrators prove to be an atypical subpopulation, or (3) sex role stereotypes have changed significantly since the reporting of earlier studies. (Author/PGD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED221927

Personality Traits of Urban Female and Male Administrators and Congruence of These Traits with the Occupational Stereotypes of the Male Managerial Model

John J. Seaberg, Jr.

University of Oklahoma

and

Maxie M. Wood

Oklahoma City Public Schools

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

John J. Seaberg

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

EA 014 999

Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York City, March 20, 1982.

Personality Traits of Urban Female and Male Administrators and Congruence of These Traits with the Occupational Stereotypes of the Male Managerial Model

JOHN J. SEABERG, University of Oklahoma
MAXIE M. WOOD, Oklahoma City Public Schools

John J. Seaberg
College of Education
University of Oklahoma
Norman, Okahoma 73019

Introduction

One important area of employment that has been, and continues to be, dominated by males is that of management within formal organizations. The absence of women is particularly evident in the field of educational administration. Although women comprise the majorities of professional teaching staffs in the United States, their presence is barely visible in top posts as heads of districts or of schools. In addition, current statistics reveal that the percentage of women occupying line administrative positions in public educatio. is declining. Neither Federal legislation to prevent sex discrimination nor the momentum of the women's movement has served to reverse this trend. There now appears to be a limited supply of women who actively seek administrative positions in public education.

Many factors, both external and internal to women, may interact to inhibit their upward occupational aspirations. Sex-role stereotyping is probably one of the most detrimental of those factors inhibiting the professional careers of women. For much of society, the distinctions between the characteristics of males and females have been translated into rigid expectations regarding the appropriate roles that members of each sex are to fulfill.

It is very early in the socialization process that male and female self-concepts regarding sex-roles are formulated and occupations preliminarily selected. Cultural definitions define what is to be considered as appropriate male and female behavior (Theordore, 1971). Women are socialized in a culture that both explicitly and implicitly defines sex roles as total roles. "A total role is one which defines a sense of self and a set of appropriate behaviors. The total role permeates all aspects of life, and takes

precedence over other more situation-specific work or social roles if they are inconsistent" (Bayes and Newton, 1978 p. 14).

Male and female sex-role behaviors are often viewed by society as mutually exclusive or at least at opposite ends of a continuum. One end of the continuum represents masculine traits and the other is reserved for feminine traits. Traits of dominance, achievement, autonomy, and aggression are attributed to males, whereas, women are expected to portray timidity, emotionalism, deference, self-abasement, and passivity (Broverman, Clarkson, Rosenkrantz, and Bogel, 1970).

Shein's studies (1973, 1975) found that middle managers are perceived by both male and female managers as having characteristics, attitudes, and temperaments more similar to those ascribed to men in general than to women in general. The findings of Shein's two studies suggest that acceptance of stereotypical male characteristics as a basis for success in management may be a necessity for women seeking to achieve in the current organizational climate.

Many women assuming positions that traditionally have been held by men attempt to pattern their behavior after the male traits. The unfortunate consequence of this line of reasoning is that women often magnify these male characteristics and become super-dominant and/or super-aggressive. In attempting to become "one of the boys" feminine qualities are sacrificed (McCarthy and Webb, 1977).

According to Holland, (1959) one theorist who has studied these phenomena as they relate to various occupations, an administrator is viewed as an enterprising person who copes with the environment by choices which permit expression of adventurous, dominant, enthusiastic, and impulsive qualities. "The administrator is characterized as persuasive, verbal, self-accepting, self-confident, aggressive, and exhibitionistic" (Isaacson, 1971 p. 34). The occupational and sex-role stereotypes which coincide with the Holland managerial model are that of the male not the female.

Objectives

The major purpose of this study was to investigate the personality traits of women and men who occupy two levels of administrative positions in education, building level and central office level, and to compare them to the male managerial model. Four questions were investigated by this study: 1) Are there differences between the personality traits of female and male educational administrators? 2) Are there differences between the personality traits of female administrators at the central office and building levels? 3) Are there differences between the personality traits of male administrators at the central office and building levels? and 4) Are the personality traits of women and men occupying a traditionally male occupation, educational administration, congruent with the occupational stereotypes ascribed to similar vocations?

Theoretical Framework

The theoretical framework for this study was based on the work of John L. Holland (1959). This researcher's original theoretical statement has been somewhat modified as a result of his own subsequent research. The Holland theory assumes that, "at the time of a vocational choice the person is the product of the interaction of his particular heredity with a variety of cultural and personal forces including peers, parents and significant adults, his social class, American culture, and the physical environment. Out of this experience the person develops a hierarchy of habitual or preferred methods for dealing with environmental tasks" (Holland, 1959 p. 35). The work environments that exist within the American society are the realistic (farmers, truck drivers), the investigative (chemists, biologists), the social (social workers, teachers), the conventional (bookkeepers, bank tellers), the enterprising (managers, politicians), and the artistic (musicians, artists) (Osipow, 1973).

According to Isaacson (1971) Holland's theory assumes that individuals express their personality through the choice of a vocation; each person holds stereotypes of various vocations that have psychological and sociological relevance for that individual; members

of a vocation have similar personalities and therefore they will respond to many situations and problems in similar ways; and finally, that vocational satisfaction, stability, and achievement depend upon the extent to which the individual's personality and his/her work are compatible. Based on the preceeding assumptions, Holland theorizes that individuals can be classified into a limited number of personality types, and that work situations or environments can similarly be classified into the previously mentioned categories.

One shortcoming of Holland's theory is the limited applicability of the theory to women. The theory should be revised to account more adequately for the vocational development of women, whose development and vocational tasks and goals differ enough from men to require some different formulations (Osipow, 1973).

Methodology

The instrument utilized to gather data for the study was the Adjective Check List (ACL) developed by Gough and Heilburn (1965). The ACL consists of 300 behavioral adjectives involving 24 needs scales, from which an individual is requested to choose those adjectives which are most self-descriptive. Each of the 24 need scales provides a total raw score derived by obtaining the algebraic sum of indicative adjectives minus contraindicative adjectives. Intuitive and inductive descriptions of each scale measured by the ACL are: 1) Total number of adjectives checked; 2) Defensiveness; 3) Number of favorable adjectives checked; 4) Number of unfavorable adjectives checked; 5) Self-confidence; 6) Self-control; 7) Lability; 8) Personal adjustment; 9) Achievement; 10) Dominance; 11) Endurance; 12) Order; 13) Intraception; 14) Nurturance; 15) Affiliation; 16) Heterosexuality; 17) Exhibition; 18) Autonomy; 19) Aggression; 20) Change; 21) Succorance; 22) Abasement; 23) Deference; and 24) Counseling Readiness.

The ACL was distributed via the U.S. Mail to 64 female (total population) and 64 male (randomly selected) administrators employed by a southwestern urban public school system. The data collection instrument was completed and returned by 79.7% of the administrators in the sample. Raw scores on each ACL scale were converted to standard

scores for purposes of comparison. The following groups were compared: 1) Female and male administrators; 2) Female central office and female building level administrators; 3) Male central office and male buidling level administrators.

After the data were collected, statistical analyses were performed to determine whether or not significant differences existed among the groups. The treatments applied were as follows:

1. To determine whether or not there were statistically significant differences (alpha = 0.05) between the personality traits of male and female educational administrators as measured by each scale of the ACL, a t-test (Nie, Hull, Jenkins, Steinbrenner, and Bent, 1970) was performed on each of the ACL's 24 scales.

2. To determine whether or not there were statistically significant differences (alpha = 0.05) between the personality traits of female administrators at the central office and building levels as measured by each scale of the ACL, a t-test (Nie, et al., 1970) was performed on each of the ACL's 24 scales.

3. To determine whether or not there were statistically significant differences (alpha = 0.05) between the personality traits of male administrators at the central office and building levels as measured by each scale of the ACL, a t-test (Nie, et al., 1970) was performed on each of the ACL's scales.

4. Tc determine whether or not there were statistically significant differences (alpha = 0.05) between the frequency of high and low ACL scores of female and male educational administrators, a 2 x 2 Chi square analysis (Siegel, 1956) was performed on each of the traits similar to those ascribed to the male managerial model.

Data Source

The sample of subjects for this study was drawn from the population of female and male elementary school, middle school, high school, and central office level administrators in a southwesern urban public school system. Permission was requested through the school system's Department of Planning, Research, and Evaluation to conduct this study.

Specific permission to conduct this study was granted by the Research Screening Committee assigned to review this request.

The population for this study was comprised of all administratively certificated female and male principals and assistant principals and all central office administrators with titles such as superintendent, assistant superintendent, assistant to the superintendent, director, assistant director, and coordinator. Because of the limited number of females at the administrative level in the system, the entire population of female administrators was included in this study. Male administrators for this study were selected through a stratified random sampling technique.

Findings

Analyses of the data provided by the subjects completed ACL's were used to report the investigations findings and to compare those findings with society's occupational stereotypes of the male managerial model.

Multiple t tests of the data indicated that female and male administrators' mean ($\bar{X}$) scores were significantly different ($p<.05$) on 12 of the 24 personality traits measured by the Adjective Check List (appendix table 1). Central office female administrators scored significantly higher than building level female administrators on four of the personality traits (appendix Table 2). There were no statistically significant differences between the mean scores of central office male administrators and building level male administrators on any of the 24 ACL scales (appendix Table 3).

Total Adjectives checked

The personalogical dispositions associated with the tendency to check more or fewer words according to Gough and Heilburn (1965) are as follows:

> The individual high on this variable tends to be described as emotional, adventurous, wholesome, conservative, enthusiastic, unintelligent, frank, and helpful. He is active, apparently means well, but tends to blunder. The man with low scores tends more often to be quiet and reserved, more tentative and cautious in his approach to problems, and perhaps at times unduly tactiturn and aloof. He is more apt to think originally and inventively, but is perhaps less effective in getting things done p. 7.

Analysis of the data revealed that the mean ($\bar{X}$) score of male administrators (50.04) was significantly higher than the mean ($\bar{X}$) score of female administraotrs (37.69) on the total number of adjectives checked scale. This difference was statistically significant at the .001 level.

Favorable Adjectives Checked

Personalogical dispositions characteristic of the person scoring higher or lower on the favorable scale according to Gough and Heilburn (1965) are:

> The individual who checks many of the words in the favorable list appears to be motivated by a strong desire to do well and impress others, but always by virtue of hard work and conventional endeavor. The reaction of others is to see him as dependable, steady, conscientious, mannerly, and serious; there is also the suspicion that he may be too concerned about others, and lacking in verve and quickness of mind. The low scoring subject is much more of an individualist - more often seen as clever, sharp witted, headstrong, pleasure seeking, and original in thought and behavior. His emotions being more accessible, he also more often experiences anxiety, self-doubts, and perplexities p. 8.

Comparison of female (59.78) and male (53.33) administrators' mean ($\bar{X}$) score responses on the favorable scale revealed that female administrators scored significantly higher than male administrators. This difference was significant at the .001 level.

Unfavorable Adjectives Checked

Dispositions associated with the tendency to score higher or lower on the unfavorable scale identified by Gough and Heilbrun (1965) are:

> The high-scoring subject strikes others as rebellious, arrogant, careless, conceited, and cynical. He tends to be a disbeliever, a skeptic, and a threat to the complacent beliefs and attitudes of his fellows. The low-scorer is more placid, more obliging, more manerly, more tactful, and probably less intelligent p. 8.

The mean ($\bar{X}$) score of male administrators (45.33) on the unfavorable scale was significantly higher than the mean ($\bar{X}$) score of female administrators (36.09). This difference was statistically significant at the .001 level.

Self-Confidence

Dispositions of the person scoring higher or lower on the self-confidence scale listed

by Gough and Heilbrun (1965) are as follows:

> The high-scorer is assertive, affiliative, outgoing, persistent, and actionist. He wants to get things done, and is impatient with people or things standing in his way. He is concerned about creating a good impression, and is not above cutting a few corners to achieve this objective. He makes a distinct impression on others, who see him as forceful, self-confident, determined, ambitious, and opportunistic. The low-scoring person is a much less effective person in the everyday sense of the word - he has difficulty in mobilizing himself and taking action, prefering inaction and contemplation. Others see him as unassuming, forgetful, mild, preoccupied, reserved, and retiring p. 9.

Analysis of the data revealed that the mean ($\bar{X}$) score of female administrators (61.31) was significantly higher than the mean ($\bar{X}$) score of male administrators (53.24). This difference was significant at the .001 alpha level. Female central office administrators' mean ($\bar{X}$) score (64.91) was significantly higher than the mean ($\bar{X}$) score of female building level administrators (58.36) on the self-confidence scale. This difference was significant at the .009 alpha level.

Lability

Personological dispositions characteristic of the person scoring higher or lower on the lability scale are as follows according to Gough and Heilbrun (1965):

> The high-scoring subject is seen favorably as spontaneous, but unfavorably as excitable, temperamental, restless, nervous, and high-strung. The psychological equilibrium, the balance of forces, is an uneasy one in this person and he seems impelled toward change and new experience in an endless flight from his perplexities. The low-scorer is more phlegmatic, routinized, planful and conventional. He reports stricter opinions on right and wrong practices, and a greater need for order and regularity. He is described by observers as thorough, organized, steady, and unemotional p. 9.

The mean ($\bar{X}$) score of female central office administrators (46.04) was significantly higher than the mean score ($\bar{X}$) of female building level administrators. (41.57) on the lability scale. This difference was significant at the .043 alpha level.

Personal Adjustment

Characteristics associated with the tendency to score higher or lower on the

personal adjustment scale identified by Gough and Heilbrun (1965) are:

> The high-scoring subject is seen as dependable, peaceable, trusting, friendly, practical, loyal, and wholesome. He fits in well, asks for little, treats others with courtesy, and works enterprisingly toward his own goals. He may or may not understand himself psychodynamically, but he nonetheless seems to possess the capacity to "love and work." The subject low on the personal adjustment scale sees himself as at odds with other people and as moody and dissatisfied. This view is reciprocated by observers, who describe the low scorer as aloof, defensive, anxious, inhibited, worrying, withdrawn, and unfriendly. What appears to begin as a problem in self-definition eventuates as a problem in interpersonal living p. 9.

The mean ($\bar{X}$) score of female administrators (57.37) on the personal adjustment scale was significantly higher than the mean ($\bar{X}$) score of male administrators (54.22). This difference was significant at the .031 alpha level.

Achievement

Dispositions of the person scoring higher or lower on the achievement scale listed by Gough and Heilbrun (1965) are as follows:

> The high-scoring subject on Achievement is usually seen as intelligent and hard-working, but also as involved in his intellectual and other endeavors. He is determined to do well and usually succeeds. His motives are internal and goal-centered rather than competitive, and in his dealings with others he may actually be unduly trusting and optimistic. The low-scoring subject on Achievement is more skeptical, more dubious about the rewards which might come from effort and involvement, and uncertain about risking his labors. He tends also be be somewhat withdrawn and dissatisfied with his current status p. 9.

Comparison of female (62.75) and male (59.08) administrators mean ($\bar{X}$) score responses on the achievement scale revealed that female administrators scored significantly higher than male administrators. This difference was significant at the .026 alpha level.

Dominance

Gough and Heilbrun (1965) ascribe the following personological dispositions to the person scoring higher or lower on the dominance scale:

> The high-scorer on this scale is a forceful, strong-willed, and perservering individual. He is confident of his ability to do

> what he wishes and is direct and forthright in his behavior. The low-scorer on Dominance is unsure of himself, and indifferent to both the demands and the challenges of interpersonal life. He stays out of the limelight, and avoids situations calling for choice and decision-making p. 9.

The mean ($\bar{X}$) score of female administrators (61.88) on the dominance scale was significantly higher than the mean ($\bar{X}$) score of male administrators (57.88). This difference was significant at the .025 level.

Nurturance

Gough and Heilbrun (1965) ascribe the following characteristics to the person scoring higher or lower on the nurturance scale:

> The subject high on this scale is of a helpful, nurturant disposition, but sometimes too bland and self-disciplined. His dependability and benevolence are worthy qualities, but he may nonetheless be too conventional and solicitous of the other person. The subject scoring low on Nurturance is the opposite: skeptical, clever, and acute, but too self-centered and too little attentive to the feelings and wishes of others p. 10.

Analysis of the data revealed that the mean ($\bar{X}$) score of male administrators (55.92) was significantly higher than the mean ($\bar{X}$) score of female administrators (52.57) on the nurturance scale. This difference was significant at the .035 alpha level.

Aggression

Personological dispositions ascribed to the person scoring higher or lower on the aggression scale according to Gough and Heilbrun (1965) are:

> The individual high on this scale is both competitive and aggressive. He seeks to win, to vanquish, and views others as rivals. His impulses are strong, and often undercontrolled. In an appropriate situation he may drive on to worthy attainment, but often his behaviors will be self-aggrandizing and disruptive. The individual who is low on Aggression is much more of a conformist, but not necessarily lacking in courage or tenacity. He tends to be patiently diligent, and sincere in his relationships with others p. 10.

The mean ($\bar{X}$) score of female central office administrators (52.13) was significantly higher than the mean ($\bar{X}$) score of female building level administrators (47.04) on the aggression scale. This difference was significant at the .033 alpha level.

Succorance

Dispositions of the person scoring higher or lower on the succorance scale listed by Gough and Heilbrun (1965) are:

> Succorance appears to depect, at its high end, a personality which is trusting, guileless, and even naive in its faith in the integrity and benevolence of others. The high-scorer is dependent on others, seeks support, and expects to find it. The low-scorer, on the contrary, is independent, resourceful, and self-sufficient, but at the same time prudent and circumspect. He has a sort of quiet confidence in his own worth and capability p. 11.

The mean ($\bar{X}$) score of male administrators (42.22) on the succorance scale was significantly higher than the mean ($\bar{X}$) score of female administrators (37.43). This difference was significant at the .001 alpha level.

Abasement

Gough and Heilbrun (1965) ascribe the following characteristics to the person scoring higher or lower on the abasement scale:

> High-scorers on Abasement are not only submissive and self-effacing, but also appear to have problems of self-acceptance. They see themselves as weak and undeserving, and face the world with anxiety and foreboding. Their behavior is often self-punishing, perhaps in the hope of forestalling criticism and rejection from without. The low-scorer is optimistic, poised, productive, and decisive. Not fearing others, he is alert and responsive to them. His tempo is brisk, his manner confident, and his behavior effective p. 11.

Comparison of female (40.49) and male (44.67) administrators' mean ($\bar{X}$) score responses on the abasement scale revealed that male administrators scored significantly higher than female administrators. This difference was significant at the .013 alpha level.

Deference

Personological characteristics of the person scoring higher or lower on the defer ence scale are as follows according to Gough and Heilbrun (1965):

> The individual scoring high on Deference is typically conscientious, dependable, and persevering. He is self-denying not so much out of any fear of others or inferiority to them as out of a preference for anonymity and freedom from stress and external demands. He attends modestly to his affairs, seeking little, and yielding always to any reasonable claim by

> another. The individual with a low score on Deference is more energetic, spontaneous, and independent; he likes attention, likes to supervise and direct others, and to express his will. He is also ambitious, and is not above taking advantage of others and coercing them if he can attain a goal in so doing p. 11.

The mean ($\bar{X}$) score of male administrators (50.76) on the deference scale was significantly higher than the mean ($\bar{X}$) score of female administrators (46.25). This difference was significant at the .021 alpha level.

Counseling Readiness

Characteristics associated with the tendency to score higher or lower on the counseling readiness scale identified by Gough and Heilbrun (1965) are:

> The high-scorer on Counseling Readiness is predominantly worried about himself and ambivalent about his status. He feels left out of things, unable to enjoy life to the full, and unduly anxious. He tends to be preoccupied with his problems and pessimistic about his ability to resolve them constructively. The low-scorer is more or less free of these concerns. He is self-confident, poised, sure of himself and outgoing. He seeks the company of others, likes activity, and enjoys life in an uncomplicated way p. 11.

Data analysis revealed that the mean ($\bar{X}$) score of female administrators (56.10) was significantly higher than the mean ($\bar{X}$) score of male administrators (46.63) on the counseling readiness scale. This difference was significant at the .001 alpha level. The mean ($\bar{X}$) score of female central office administrators (56.61) was significantly higher than the mean ($\bar{X}$) score of female building level administrators (54.04) on the counseling readiness scale. This difference was significant at the .036 alpha level.

Male Managerial Model Traits Analysis

After reviewing the work of Isaacson (1971), McGregor (1967), Rosen and Jerdee (1973), and Shein (1973, 1975) seven scales of the Adjective Check List were selected as descriptive of the male managerial model and Holland's occupational stereotype for vocations similar to educational administrators. ACL scales selected as characteristic of the male managerial model were as follows: Dominance, Self-confidence, Aggression, Exhibition, Achievement, Autonomy, and Deference. A 2 x 2 Chi square analysis was

performed on each scale to determine whether or not there were statistically significant differences (p .05) between the number of female and male administrators yielding high and low scores on the selected personality traits.

Chi square tests indicated a significant difference between the number of female and male administrators when categorized by high and low scores on the dominance and self-confidence scales. A greater than expected proportion of female administrators scored in the high range and fewer male administrators than expected scored in the high range on both scales (Appendix Table 4).

Conclusions

Personality traits of both female and male educational administrators in this study were inconsistent with standards of sex appropriate roles found to be stereotypical in previous studies. Female educational administrators at the central office level had personality traits less consistent with those stereotypic standards of sex appropriate roles than female educational administrators at the building level. The personality traits of both levels of male educational administrators in this study (central office and building level) were inconsistent with those previously defined as society's standards of sex appropriate roles.

These results do not support the conclusions of previous studies but rather suggest one of at least three alternative conclusions: (1) that the sample in this study is simply atypical; (2) that, if typical of educational administrators, then educational administrators are an atypical sub-population; or, (3) that, if educational administrators are a representative sub-population, then sex role stereotypes have changed significantly since the reporting of earlier studies.

Female educational administrators scores on selected scales of the Adjective Check List were more congruent with the occupational stereotypes of the Male Managerial Model than scores of male educational administrators in this study. These findings suggest that Holland's theory as related to the vocation of educational administrator is more valid for the women than for the men in this study.

Notes

Bayes, M. and P. Newton. "Women in authority: a socio-psychological analysis. Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 1978, 14, pp. 7-21.

Broverman, I.K., D.M. Broverman, F.E. Clarkson, P.S. Rosenkrantz, and S.R. Vogel. "Sex-role stereotypes and clinical judgements of mental health." Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1970, 34, pp. 1-7.

Gough, H.G. and A.B. Heilbrun. The Adjective Check List Manual. Consulting Psychologists Press: Palo Alto, California, 1965.

Holland, J.L. "A theory of vocational choice." Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1959, 6, pp. 35-44.

Isaacson, L. Career information in counseling and teaching. Allyn and Bacon, Inc. Boston, 1971, pp. 33-37.

McCarthy, M. and L. Webb. "Women school administrators: a status report." NASSP Bulletin, 61, 1977, p. 408.

McGregor, D. The professional manager. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967.

Nie, N.H., C.H. Hull, J.G. Jenkins, K. Steinbrenner, and D.H. Bent. Statistical Package for the Social Sciences. McGraw-Hill: New York, 1970.

Osipow, S.H. "Holland's career typology theory of vocational behavior." Theories of Career Development. Prentice Hall: Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 1973, pp. 41-81.

Rosen, B., and T.H. Jerdee. "The influence of sex-role stereotypes on evaluations of male and female supervisory behavior." Journal of Applied Psychology, 1973, 57, pp. 44-48.

Schein, V.E. "Relationships between sex-role stereotypes and requisite management characteristics among female managers." Journal of Applied Psychology, 1975, 80, 3, pp. 340-344.

Schein, V.E. "The relationships between sex-role stereotypes and requisite management characteristics." Journal of Applied Psychology, 1973, 57, 2, pp. 95-100.

Siegel, S. Nonparametric Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences. McGraw Hill: New York, 1956, pp. 104-111.

Theodore, A. The Professional Women. Schenkman Publishing Company: Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1971, p. 9.

APPENDIX

TABLE 1

Summary of Female and Male Administrators' Mean ($\bar{X}$) Score Responses on Each Scale of the Adjective Check List

Scale	Females	Males	t Value	Probability
1. Total Adjectives Checked	37.69	50.04	7.75	.001*
2. Defensiveness	55.45	55.20	.16	.873
3. Favorable Adjectives Checked	59.78	53.33	3.49	.001*
4. Unfavorable Adjectives Checked	36.09	45.53	6.17	.001*
5. Self-Confidence	61.31	53.24	4.23	.001*
6. Self-Control	57.98	55.49	1.61	.110
7. Lability	43.59	42.25	.78	.439
8. Personal Adjustment	57.37	54.22	2.19	.031*
9. Achievement	62.75	59.08	2.27	.026*
10. Dominance	61.88	57.88	2.28	.025*
11. Endurance	60.61	59.18	1.05	.296
12 Order	59.78	56.96	1.73	.087
13. Intraception	58.12	57.02	.62	.539
14. Nurturance	52.57	55.92	2.13	.035*
15. Affiliation	51.29	50.98	.17	.862
16. Heterosexuality	45.49	48.86	1.70	.093
17. Exhibition	50.51	49.67	.45	.657
18. Autonomy	50.65	47.86	1.73	.087
19. Aggression	49.33	47.51	1.07	.288
20. Change	45.02	44.45	.31	.760
21. Succorance	37.43	42.22	4.34	.001*
22. Abasement	40.49	44.67	2.54	.013*
23. Deference	46.25	50.76	2.34	.021*
24. Counseling Readiness	56.10	46.63	5.36	.001*

*$p < .05$

TABLE 2

Summary of Female Central Office and Building Level Administrators' Mean ($\bar{X}$) Score Responses on Each Scale of the Adjective Check List

Scale	Central Office Females	Building Level Females	t Value	Probability
1. Total Adjectives Checked	35.52	39.46	1.89	.065
2. Defensiveness	54.52	56.21	.79	.435
3. Favorable Adjectives Checked	60.78	58.96	.64	.523
4. Unfavorable Adjectives Checked	34.43	37.43	1.14	.262
5. Self-Confidence	64.91	58.36	2.74	.009*
6. Self-Control	57.00	58.79	.76	.453
7. Lability	46.04	41.57	2.08	.043*
8. Personal Adjustment	57.39	57.36	.02	.986
9. Achievement	63.61	62.04	.72	.478
10. Dominance	63.26	60.75	1.12	.267
11. Endurance	59.12	61.79	1.30	.203
12. Order	58.83	60.57	.70	.488
13. Intraception	58.83	57.54	.55	.587
14. Nurturance	51.48	53.46	.98	.334
15. Affiliation	50.30	52.11	.73	.472
16. Heterosexuality	44.43	46.36	.81	.422
17. Exhibition	52.91	48.54	1.65	.105
18. Autonomy	52.61	49.04	1.68	.099
19. Aggression	52.13	47.04	2.19	.033*
20. Change	46.57	43.75	1.20	.238
21. Succorance	37.22	37.61	.25	.802
22. Abasement	38.13	42.43	1.89	.064
23. Deference	44.78	47.46	1.01	.316
24. Counseling Readiness	56.61	54.04	2.16	.036*

*$p<.05$

TABLE 3

Summary of Male Central and Building Level Administrators' Mean ($\bar{X}$) Score Responses on Each Scale of the Adjective Check List

Scale	Central Office Males	Building Level Males	t Value	Probability*
1. Total Adjectives Checked	49.24	50.81	.66	.514
2. Defensiveness	55.12	55.27	.06	.952
3. Favorable Adjectives Checked	54.60	52.12	1.03	.309
4. Unfavorable Adjectives Checked	45.24	45.81	.36	.721
5. Self-Confidence	54.36	52.15	.77	.446
6. Self-Control	55.32	55.65	.16	.877
7. Lability	44.28	40.31	1.53	.132
8. Personal Adjustment	54.24	54.19	.02	.982
9. Achievement	59.92	58.27	.69	.492
10. Dominance	59.56	56.27	1.22	.229
11. Endurance	59.76	58.62	.59	.558
12. Order	56.88	57.04	.07	.942
13. Intraception	57.44	56.62	.30	.763
14. Nurturance	54.32	57.46	1.31	.195
15. Affiliation	49.76	52.15	.90	.370
16. Heterosexuality	48.36	49.35	.31	.756
17. Exhibition	49.28	50.04	.28	.779
18. Autonomy	49.64	46.15	1.47	.147
19. Aggression	48.80	46.27	1.04	.302
20. Change	44.68	44.23	.16	.877
21. Succorance	41.52	42.88	.85	.397
22. Abasement	42.92	46.35	1.49	.144
23. Deference	48.84	52.62	1.35	.182
24. Counseling Readiness	46.60	46.65	.02	.985

*$p < .05$

TABLE 4

Summary of Observed Frequency of Female and Male Administrators Scores Falling in Low and High Categories of Selected Personality Traits as Measured by the Adjective Check List

Scales	Females Low	Females High	Males Low	Males High	Chi Square	Probability
1. Dominance	6	45	13	38	2.328	.0127*
2. Self-Confidence	7	44	21	30	8.3195	.0039*
3. Aggression	31	20	32	19	0.000	1.0000
4. Exhibition	20	31	28	23	1.9283	.1650
5. Achievement	4	47	11	40	2.8138	.0935
6. Autonomy	23	28	30	21	1.4139	.2344
7. Deference	33	18	28	23	0.65254	.4192

*$p < .05$